



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,964	09/29/2006	Tomoki Todo	042715-5024	1879
9629	7590	07/03/2008	EXAMINER	
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004				SALIMI, ALI REZA
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1648				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/03/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/594,964	TODO, TOMOKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	A R. Salimi	1648	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 September 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/22/07, 9/29/06</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 1648.

Claims 1-16 are pending.

Submitted Information Disclosure Statement (I.D.S) is noted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-6, 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is vague and indefinite for recitation of “an enhancer of anticancer activity”, the intended metes and bounds of anticancer enhancer has not been defined. This affects the dependent claims 2-6.

Claim 15 is vague and indefinite for recitation of “an agent”, the intended “agent” is not defined. This affects claim 16.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 7-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating cancer, does not reasonably provide enablement for preventing cancer. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The scope of the claims are directed to vaccines against cancer. Preventing cancer

is considered to be highly unpredictable. Applicants have general statements regarding the vaccine composition against cancer and induction of protective response. However with regard to an unpredictable field, this does not constitute an adequate disclosure. See Fiers v. Revel, 984 F.2d 1164, 25 USPQ2d 1601 (Fed. Cir. 1993); and also decision by the Federal Circuit with regard to the enablement issues see Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk, 108 F.3d 1361, 42 USPQ2d 1001 (Fed.Cir. 1997). For example, the CAFC stated that “It is the specification, not the knowledge of one skilled in the art that must supply the novel aspects of an invention in order to constitute enablement.” (See page 1005 of the decision). In the instant case the specification does not teach or provide any guidance for development of a vaccine for to prevent cancer. This means the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. See In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The disclosure must adequately guide the art worker to determine, without undue experimentation. Applicant cannot rely on the knowledge of those skilled in the art to enable the claims without providing adequate teaching. Therefore, considering large quantity of experimentation needed, the unpredictability of the field, the state of the art, and breadth of the claims, it is concluded that undue experimentation would be required to enable the intended claim. Many of these factors have been summarized In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a **written description** of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. In the instant disclosure, the applicants have not disclosed "an agent." Therefore, a written description of the agent(s) should be disclosed to overcome this rejection. See also *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.*, 43 USPQ2d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1997), which teaches that the disclosure of a process for obtaining cDNA from a particular organism and the description of the encoded protein fail to provide an adequate written description of the actual cDNA from that organism which would encode the protein from that organism, despite the disclosure of a cDNA encoding that protein from another organism. 35 USC 112 requires *inter alia* that a patent specification contain a written description of the invention and the manner and process of making and using it "in such full clear and concise terms as to enable one skilled in the art ... to make and use" the invention. Case law has made it clear that the requirements for a "written description" and an "enabling disclosure" are separate. For example, where a specification contains sufficient information to enable a skilled chemist to produce a particular compound because it gives detailed information on how to produce analogous compounds but it makes no reference to the compound in question, the "written description" requirement has not been met even though the description may be enabling.

See *University of California v. Eli Lilly*, 19 F.3d 1559, 43 USPQ 2d 1398 (Fed, Cir. 1997):

The name cDNA is not in itself a written description of that DNA; it conveys no distinguishing information concerning its identity. While the example provides a process for obtaining human insulin-encoding cDNA, there is no further information in the patent pertaining to that cDNA's relevant structural or physical characteristics; in other words, it thus does not describe human insulin cDNA Accordingly, the specification does not provide a written description of the invention

and at pg 1406:

a generic statement such as "vertebrate insulin cDNA" or "mammalian insulin cDNA," without more, is not an adequate written description of the genus because it does not distinguish the genus from others, except by function. It does not specifically define any of the genes that fall within its definition. It does not define any structural features commonly possessed by members of the genus that distinguish them from others. One skilled in the art therefore cannot, as one can do with a fully described genus, visualize or recognize the identity of the members of the genus. A definition by function, as we have previously indicated, does not suffice to define the genus because it is only an indication of what the genes does, not what it is.

See *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ 2d 1016 at page 1021:

A gene is a chemical compound, albeit a complex one, and ... conception of a chemical compound requires that the inventor be able to define it so as to distinguish it from other materials Conception does not occur unless one has a mental picture of the structure of the chemical or is able to define it by its method of preparation, its physical or chemical properties, or whatever characteristics sufficiently distinguish it. It is not sufficient to define it solely by its principal biological property, e.g., encoding human erythropoietin, because an alleged conception having no more specificity than that is simply a wish to know the identity of any material with that biological property.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Coffin (US 2003/0091537 A1).

The teaching and claims of the above cited reference clearly anticipates the broad limitations of the claimed invention (see the abstract, and claims 1-6, 14-19). Coffin disclosed a

replication defective herpesvirus wherein gamma 34.5 gene, ICP6 gene, and ICP47 are deleted

(see claims 1, and 5). In addition, he taught herpes virus expresses an immunomodulatory

protein, which reads on the enhancer limitation (see claim 1). Also, he taught the

immunomodulatory gene could be a cytokine, which reads on IL-18 and IL-12 (see claim 2).

Applicants are reminded that limitation of cytokine broadly reads on the genus, and includes its

members IL-18 and IL-12. Moreover, Coffin taught the method of treating tumor utilizing the

defective herpesvirus and an agent for treating cancer (see claims 17-19). Additionally, under

inherency doctrine where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially

identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical

processes, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has been established. See, *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252,

1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al (WO 02/076216 A1) and Yamanaka et al (Cancer Immunol. Immunother. 1999, 48(6):297-302).

Johnson et al disclosed a herpes virus expression vector wherein ICP47 and gamma 34.5 regions are inactivated (see claims 4, 28). In addition, they taught inactivation of ICP6 region as

well (See claim 5). They also taught the method of utilizing the vector in inducing immune response (see claims 6-8). In addition, they taught expression of all types of cytokines (see page 10, lines 30). This only differs since they did not disclose expression of both IL-18 and IL-12 at the same time.

Yamanaka et al taught utilization of both IL-12 and IL-18 showed synergistic efficacy against tumor (see the abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate both IL-12 and IL-18 as taught by Yamanaka et al into expression vector taught by Johnson et al to induce an enhancing response against neoplasia. One of skilled in the art being familiar with the above cited teaching at the time the invention was filed would not have anticipated any unexpected results. Thus, the prior art provides the teaching as to the appropriate vector, and the cytokines that lend themselves to enhanced activity. The art suggest that combination of IL-12 and IL-18 is beneficial in treating tumors. And one would have been motivated by the above cited art to induce a synergistic effect against cancer cells. Applicants are reminded that the combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results. See KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. (2007). Thus, the invention as a whole is deemed *prima facie* obvious absent any unexpected results.

No claims are allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to A. R. Salimi whose telephone number is (571) 272-0909. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 Am to 6:00 Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell, can be reached on (571) 272-0974. The Official fax number is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/A R Salimi/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1648

06/27/2008

Application/Control Number: 10/594,964
Art Unit: 1648

Page 9